DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 022 RE 004 072

AUTHOR Pascual, Henry W., Ed.
TITLE Reading Strategies for New Mexico in the 70's.
PUB DATE Jan 72
NOTE 29p.; Resource Guide Number 2

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Diagnostic Teaching; Formative Evaluation; Individual Differences; Informal Reading Inventory; Minority Groups; *Reading Instruction; Reading Materials; *Reading Material Selection; *Spanish Speaking; Standardized Tests; Teaching Methods; *Test Selection

ABSTRACT

The three papers in this resource guide are oriented to the needs of Spanish-surnamed and Indian children. The first paper points out three concerns to be examined before selecting reading materials: (1) the population for whom selection is planned, (2) criteria emphasizing children's needs, and (3) apparent trends in reading instructional materials appropriate for the population. Critical points for selection and evaluation of reading instructional materials for Indian and Spanish-speaking children are discussed. The second paper stresses teacher-student interaction, diagnostic teaching, and classroom management in the elementary school. The author feels that standardized tests, especially their norms, should not be used with minority groups, but that the informal reading inventory is best for these children. He also refers to four approaches used to teach non-English-speaking children and to four language measures. The third paper observes that schools are serving the interests of the dominant social forces, and that while unable to reform schools, teachers can humanize their classrooms by examining and revising certain beliefs which lend to anti-humanistic school practices. Recognition of individual differences and use of evaluation as formative in a diagnostic sense are strongly recommended. References are included. (NH)

ED 061022

Resource Guide No. 2 contains papers presented at a leadership training conference on Reading for Disadvantaged Children held in Albuquerque on April 30, 1971.

The Guide and the Conference were Financed with ESEA, Title I Administrative Funds, New Mexico State Department of Education.

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare and no official endorsement by H.E.W. should be inferred.

RECEIVED
FEB 21 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

READING

STRATEGIES FOR NEW MEXICO IN THE 70'S

Resource Guide No.2

Edited by
Henry W. Pascual
Coordinator

Communicative Arts Unit
Division of
Instructional Services

Regina Holyan, Specialist
Cultural Diversity

Bill Trujillo, Specialist
Cultural Diversity

Wayne Weimer, Specialist
Language Arts

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

State Department of Education
Leonard J. De Layo
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Santa Fe, New Mexico
January, 1972

Introduction

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act became a reality in 1965, educators across the state gave reading the highest priority in their efforts to solve the many educational problems in the schools. This emphasis has been continued sometimes with good results and sometimes without any identifiable progress or specific solutions. After several years of remedial reading, developmental reading, programmed materials, and the many approaches used by teachers trying to solve the "reading problem," everyone is aware of the fact that unless we pay closer attention to the learner, all other emphases are in vain.

Interest in and special attention to the needs of the learner call for a humanistic philosophy to teaching rather than the mechanistic approach so prevalent in many classrooms. Although a humanistic educational philosophy should be the goal in any setting, it is especially needed in New Mexico where an estimated forty-four percent of the children are culturally and linguistically different.

The papers included in this resource guide are oriented to the needs of the Spanish and Indian-speaking children. They deal with three important and interrelated topics -- testing, teaching materials, and the school as a societal force. It is hoped that each of these papers will act as a catalyst for change, not only in the area of reading, but for changes in the entire curriculum.

It is not our intention to promote change for the sake of change. It is perhaps more dangerous to embrace a new philosophy suddenly without knowing what it will produce, than to modify the known by discarding what is obviously counter-productive. What is needed is an unbiased appraisal of our beliefs, methods, and actions and discard or modify them if they are not serving the purposes of education.

H.W.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Selecting Reading Materials – Student Concerns 1
by Dr. Richard D. Van Dongen
Department of Elementary Education
University of New Mexico

Suitability of Tests for Spanish-surnamed and Indian Children 8
by Dr. Miles V. Zintz
Department of Elementary Education
University of New Mexico

Ungrading Teachers' Minds 19
by Dr. Keith Auger
Department of Elementary Education
University of New Mexico

SELECTING READING MATERIALS – STUDENT CONCERNS

Serious effort must be made to hold to the major purpose of selecting reading materials. The major purpose of selection and evaluation must be choosing instructional materials which are relevant, offer success, interest, meaningfulness, and encourage growth in thinking, attitudes, and reading skills for each child. If instructional materials provide these opportunities for every child, the development of favorable attitudes and commitment to reading may be a feasible goal.

Rather than discussing and evaluating specific reading programs in terms of the merits of the program, one should place emphasis on concerns about the child who must be considered in the selection and use of materials for his reading instruction. This view would suggest that criteria for selection and evaluation would be developed from an assessment of the child's needs rather than solely from the merits of the reading materials. The relationship of the child's physical, mental, linguistic, experiential, and emotional development to the reading material may take precedence over an assessment of the sequence of instruction, convenience in use of the teachers' manuals, format, literary content, etc.

In this paper, I plan to examine concerns about selecting materials for state adoption in reading by (1) indicating the population for whom selection is planned and delineating certain boundaries for the materials I am including, (2) developing criteria emphasizing children's needs, and (3) examining apparent trends in reading instructional materials which are supportive to the needs of children of the described population.

General description of the population and the kinds of reading materials to be considered. Within the framework of today's meeting, the selecting of materials which spark interest, are meaningful, and provide opportunities for successful growth in skills, thinking, and attitudes for each and every child has special significance for the school districts of New Mexico. The emphasis on each child provides the opportunity to focus upon groups of children for whom reading instruction has significantly not sparked interest, has not been meaningful, and has not provided opportunities for successful growth in skills, thinking, and attitudes. Many Indian and Spanish-speaking children have experienced such frustration. While it may seem very obvious, perhaps *it needs to be emphasized that evaluation and selection of reading programs for these children must take into account the linguistic and cultural factors involved before the decision in selection is made and not after this decision.*

The scope of this paper is limited to reacting to the kinds of materials reviewed and recommended for adoption on the state textbook list last fall, 1970, under the subject heading of reading. No bilingual materials are included. All materials reviewed were in English and primarily designed for teaching reading to English-speaking children. The scope therefore does not deal sufficiently with linguistic and cultural factors to suggest some real, feasible alternatives to basic reading instruction.

Before a discussion of selection and evaluation related to the materials within the scope of this paper, some alternatives dealing more completely with linguistic and cultural factors should be suggested, Current efforts in bilingual education suggest that "the child's home language is almost always the most completely developed; therefore it is the best medium for teaching children to read and write."[1] Creative efforts in writing materials in the languages of Spanish and Navajo for

New Mexico children are in progress. Two such efforts at the University of New Mexico should soon be producing and field testing materials both linguistically and culturally appropriate to Spanish-speaking and Navajo children.

Professor Dolores Gonzales and her staff are writing materials in Spanish. The research and design going into the project is impressive; the programs are relevant to New Mexico children. Professor Bernard Spolsky is directing the Navajo Reading Project. Initial reading instruction is being planned in the Navajo language. Both projects are housed in the Department of Elementary Education. I would urge correspondence with these projects as materials for these children are being selected. Correspondence can be forwarded to either project by writing:

Department of Elementary Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Another resource for examining reading materials for Spanish-speaking children is the Anita Osuna Carr Memorial Library. The library's collections of instructional materials and children's literature in the Spanish language grow daily. It is a fascinating resource and a must for visiting, studying, and evaluating materials. It is also housed with the Department of Elementary Education.

Commericial materials for Spanish-speaking children are beginning to appear. *Mis primeras lecturas,*[2] a Spanish language readiness and beginning to read program is based on the English pre-reading program, *Getting Ready to Read.*[3] Instruction in reading in the Spanish language precedes the introduction into reading in English.

Reading programs primarily developed for the teaching of reading of English where English is the second language should also be evaluated before selection decisions are made. *The Miami Linguistic Readers*[4] are being used successfully in some districts of New Mexico. The readers consist of "a program of organized, sequential materials which provide pupils with systematic practice on the essentials of language. The pupils are given oral practice before they begin to read. And the oral reading practice is reinforced with writing exercises."[5]

The content and instructional techniques supported by the above materials may provide a solid foundation for some Indian and Spanish-speaking children. However, many supplementary materials are needed for supplementing any basic program. For some Indian and Spanish-speaking children reading programs in English may be used early in their educational development; for other children, English reading may appear later. For all children competency in the reading of English must eventually be gained. At some stage of development, appropriate English materials must be selected.

Developing criteria emphasizing needs of the children for whom selection of materials is being made. The central focus of this paper is to discuss factors which should be considered in order that selected materials will contribute to successful learning experiences for each child. The criteria are for application to reading materials on the state-adopted textbook list. These are written in English; the materials may serve the purpose of developmental reading instruction or supplemental enrichment and aid to a structured language program. With the wide variety of materials available, selection should include a combination of materials which will best fit a child's learning needs.

A compilation of readings, *Reading for the Disadvantaged:* Problems of Linguistically Different Learners,[6] provided an excellent reference point for developing criteria to be used in evaluation. Factors about the child's development in values, language, cognition, and literacy were pulled. The following list of criteria was derived from the writings for the purpose of use in selection and evaluation of reading instruction materials.

CRITICAL POINTS FOR EVALUATING READING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR INDIAN AND SPANISH–SPEAKING CHILDREN

I. How does this reading program support the child's development of his attitudes and his values?

   A. Can the child's self-concept be built through:

      1. Successful learning experiences?
      2. Support for values of his culture?

   B. Is there support for translating values of the child's culture in such a way that respect and appreciation are not lost as the child learns those values of the school and the majority of society?(7)

II. How do the linguistic factors emphasized in the reading program relate to the child's linguistic background?

   A. Will the phonological and structural characteristics emphasized in instruction insure success in reading?

   B. Is attention to special words such as prepositions, conjunctions, or modifiers provided for?

   C. Is there opportunity for the child to develop pride of his own language and culture while providing for the development of language skills for all occasions?

   D. Will the child have opportunity to develop the skill of reading as a meaning-seeking process?

III. What opportunities does the child have for language usage?

   A. *Has development and practice of oral language been planned for?*

   B. *Has development in language and vocabulary preceded the teaching of reading?*

   C. Is there an attempt to use the child's life experiences in order to promote language growth?

IV. What conceptual, experiential, and cognitive development has been planned for?

   A. Has acquisition of experiences preceded acquisition of symbols for the experiences?

   B. Are concrete experiences related to appropriate symbols in oral language provided?

   C. Have difficulties with abstractions been minimized?

   D. Have the building of meaning and the skills of inquiry been planned for?

   E. Are thoughtful, interpretive questions suggested?

   F. Is there a variety of learning activities planned?

V. Is the child's literacy development assured?

A. Are there ways for bringing the child into the tradition of literacy?

B. Is children's literature designed as an integral part of the reading program?

VI. How does the reading program aid the teacher in the diagnosis and prescription for each child?

The first five major areas are student concerns. The child must be carefully assessed in these areas and then compared to the reading material under evaluation for selection.

Current trends in reading instructional materials supportive to the needs of childern of the described population. As the above criteria are discussed, the third purpose of this paper will be inserted. This purpose was an examination of apparent trends observed in currently adopted reading materials supportive to Indian and Spanish-speaking children. Niles[8] suggested two major developments as being influential in changes made in recently published reading materials: (1) a search for relevancy and (2) multimedia approaches. As the six major criteria are discussed these two trends as well as some specific observations will be reviewed.

The child's development of his attitudes, his values, and his self-concept is perhaps the most critical factor in success in school and therefore success in reading achievement. Probably the teacher's attitudes and the way of using materials will have far more impact in growth in self-concept and attitudes than the specific content or curricular designs developed in reading programs. Yet, there may be factors that can be identified in the reading programs which support or frustrate the child's affective growth.

The materials should be reviewed for the purpose of determining if the child could be assured of successful learning experiences. Activities must be within the child's range of successful performance. A reading program offering a variety of activities for achieving a certain objective may provide an alternative which can be successfully accomplished by a child. A child who learns better visually may need different activities than a child who learns best auditorily. There is some effort in current programs to provide this variety of activities so that all children can experience success. The development of multimedia has been influential in the development of this variety.

Relevancy has also influenced trends in readers as related to attitudes and values. One major criticism of readers has been the portrayal of the Anglo middle class family accompanied by the values held by this group. If such content is not appropriate for many children, new reading programs should be examined for the values held in the content. Some series of readers emphasize content other than that centered around the activities of a family. Animal characters, folk tales, and children's literature may appear even in beginning readers. If the family and community settings are used, there is probably evidence of a multi-ethnic setting. Some programs have incorporated Navajo tales while others may include Spanish-speaking children who live in an urban setting.

A few supplemental series have been written for the expressed purpose of promoting growth in values and self-concept. *The Human Values Series,* published by Steck-Vaughn, and the *Triple "I" Series,* published by American Book Company, may begin to provide materials emphasizing the child's growth in his values, attitudes, and self-concept.

Linguistic factors have taken on new insight and importance in reading instruction. Perhaps this current awareness could be helpful in comparing phonological and structural elements emphasized in reading instruction with the child's linguistic background.

Structural elements may be of particular interest in reading programs for Indian and

Spanish-speaking children. An effort to develop reading content with natural language as early as possible rather than the artificial structure previously used in pre-primers and primers is evident. Relevancy in reading materials has been influential in this development. There is a control of structure to allow systematic instruction and experience with common syntactical patterns used in English. Sentence building and sentence practice drills with word substitution can be adopted or emphasized in these materials as they are in materials for teaching English as a second language.

Attention to special word classes such as prepositions, conjunctions, and modifiers may receive deliberate attention in certain programs, particularly those following increasing emphases on the total language process rather than on the specific reading process as one aspect of language. For instruction in these word classes, multimedia materials may provide more concrete learning experiences.

The emphasis on reading as a meaning-seeking process as stressed in some reading programs provides opportunity for students to become involved with the meaning of what they read. An important implication of the meaning-seeking process is that the reader relies heavily on his own experiential background. This would indicate that the content of the reading must be within the child's experiential background if the student is to be successful.

The quest for relevancy and the use of multimedia have supported more emphasis on the total language process. Opportunities for language usage can be assessed in the activities designed in each reading program. Oral language activities are often built into the instructional program; drama and role-playing activities may appear frequently.

Language experiences may be dictated orally by the child, copied by the teacher, and then read by the child. Total language experience programs, building on what language skills the child has acquired, are available. *We Go to School,* published by Addison-Wesley, and *Language Experiences in Reading,* published by Encyclopedia Britannica Press, are foundation reading programs based on language experience.

The use of multimedia in activities with records, tapes, filmstrips, puppets, objects, and many kinds of reading materials provide excellent opportunities for language usage. A multimedia kit such as *Children's World,* published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, provides much stimulation for language usage. The rhythms and sounds of the language as emphasized in the *Kin/Der Owl Books,* published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, provide opportunities for listening, speaking, and language awareness.

Many materials which aid language usage may also promote conceptual, experiential, and cognitive growth. Materials need to be examined for appropriateness to the child's experiences. *If the acquisition of experiences for the reading content takes place simultaneously with the acquisition of reading skills, the task is too complex.* Therefore, materials which build on the child's concepts and experiences may be preferable. If materials do require new experiences and concepts, the opportunities for this development must be provided for.

Along with relevancy and multimedia influences, insights in cognitive development and in learning modalities have influenced current reading programs. Concrete objects and related activities may minimize abstractness and focus on conceptual development. Auditory, visual, and tactile senses are used in many activities. A large variety of reading books and materials provide a wide range of content and learning activities. Cognitive development in readers should be examined in other areas than conceptual and experiential concerns. Questions in manuals should provide thoughtful, interpretive, and critical thinking activities.

Literacy development as described in the criteria above is focused on opportunities provided for contact with the world of literacy and the tradition of the literate person. The creative ideas of man should be part of the reading program. Children's literature, both in variety and quality, is generously emphasized in many current reading programs.

There is more emphasis on diagnostic aids and tools in current reading programs. Several programs have informal checklists and inventories of reading skills and abilities. The *Houghton Mifflin Readers* or *Reading 360,* published by Ginn and Company, offer good examples of diagnostic tools for the teacher. An encouraging development in diagnostic tools has been diagnosis of many facets of language development rather than specifically reading skills. Such an emphasis should have considerable merit for Indian and Spanish-speaking children.

Probably other factors need to be considered in selection of materials from state-adopted reading materials. However, with an emphasis on the analysis of the child and a comparison of the child's learning needs with the reading program, perhaps a better match can be made. For many Indian and Spanish-speaking children significantly different alternatives in beginning reading and developmental reading must be tried. Present knowledge of linguistic and cultural factors should play an important role in the evaluating and selecting process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Judith Rae Gates. "The Bilingually Advantaged," *Todays Education*, December 1970, p. 39

2. Sara de Valdes, *et. al. Mis primeras lecturas.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

3. William K. Durr, *et. al. Getting Ready to Read.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

4. Ralph F. Robinett, *et. al. Miami Linguistic Readers.* Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1970.

5. _____. "Preface," *Miami Linguistic Readers.* Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1970.

6. Thomas D. Horn, ed. *Reading for the Disadvantaged: Problems of Linguistically Different Learners.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970.

7. L. Jean York and Dorothy Ebert. "Implications for Teachers; Primary Level: Grades 1–3," *Reading for the Disadvantaged: Problems of Linguistically Different Learners,* edited by T.D. Horn. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970, p. 179.

8. Olive S. Niles. "School Programs: The Necessary Conditions," *Reading: Process and Program.* Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970.

SUITABILITY OF TESTS FOR SPANISH–SURNAMED AND INDIAN CHILDREN

I. Introduction

The consideration of how to suitably test children begins with three basic concerns about teacher-child interaction in the elementary school. First, is the real concern that many teachers do *not* interact sufficiently with children, do not feel comfortable interacting, and do allow many learning problems to "snowball" because they fail to generate adequate "affect" to put learning in a positive, constructive frame of reference. Second, is the concern that we do not teach diagnostically–do not worry enough about measuring the entry skills or entry behaviors to find out what a child knows or doesn't know so we *know what* to teach him. And third, is the concern that many teachers do not know how to *manage* a classroom full of children, or manage new ways of directing learning experiences so that each child can profit from coming to school.

It may help to shape our thinking, if we ask, "*Who* has all the problems of academic achievement and learning to read in the elementary school?" I would suggest that it is the teachers and the principals who have problems rather than the children. If teachers and principals were not so handicapped, they would see children positively, with much potential, innately anxious to grow up, to expand their horizons, and move boldly to face the exciting world they live in.

Who, the child or the teacher, believes that *all* first graders *must* learn 178 basic sight words to complete the first grade reading program? Who, the fourth grade teacher or the child, believes that all fourth graders *must* learn the 81 multiplication and division facts? Who, the first grader or the reading supervisor, starts the vicious old wives' tale that *every* child *must* give up his line marker when he progresses from his pre-primer to his first hard-backed reader?

Our system of education isn't working for many of the children; but how hard do we work to change the system? *Room management adjustments like rooms without desks, or private office carrels for hyper-active or too-talkative children or curricular changes like using many other channels for learning besides reading and writing, these are a few ways to change school operation.* A few schools are daring to change the system and are reaping positive results.

While it is true that educational and psychological tests will help if intelligently used and interpreted, the history of their use in New Mexico does not at all attest to such sensitivity. This paper will cite only one example: Haught[1] tested the hypothesis that the longer Spanish-surnamed children went to school, the less handicapped they would be by the use of the English language there. Therefore, one could administer the usual standardized intelligence tests and the older students would not have a language handicap so their intelligence scores would be "accurate" or "valid" and should fit the normal curve of distribution. However, Haught found that the older students were as handicapped as the younger ones. He *even determined* that Spanish-American children, on the average, have an I. Q. of 79 compared to the I. Q. score of 100 for the average Anglo.

The naive statement that students would gain language sophistication merely by attending school and that they would develop all the necessary academic vocabulary for keeping up in their subject matter hardly seems logical even for 1930; it can certainly not be excused today. Yet, when

---

[1]B. F. Haught, "The Language Difficulty of Spanish-American Children," *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 15:92-95, February, 1931.

administrators do not establish a curriculum that will systematically and consciously develop such language sophistication along with an understanding of the cultural differences that exist, the same naive hypothesis is being perpetuated.

During the past fourteen years, we have developed a number of vocabulary tests to sample children's knowledge of idioms, slang expressions, multiple meanings and simple analogies. I will cite briefly two references to these.

A seventh grade social studies teacher administered a multiple meanings test and an idioms test to his multi-ethnic class in a small school in New Mexico. Eleven Anglo students earned a mean score of 82% on multiple meanings; sixteen Spanish-surnamed, 68% and nine Navajos, 43%. Eleven Anglos earned a mean score of 81% on a test of common idioms; sixteen Spanish-surnamed, 54%; and nine Navajos 34%. This teacher, who had no orientation to the problems of teaching English to speakers of other languages, was very much surprised with these results. Although school had been in session about six weeks when he administered it, he was not expecting such divergent scores.

Candelaria prepared a 75-item simple analogies test and sampled sixth grade Anglo and Spanish-surnamed students from a middle-class section of Albuquerque, Spanish-surnamed students from the lower socio-economic area, and Negro students from the downtown area. Mean scores for the four groups ranked them first, Anglo; second, middle-class Spanish-surnamed; third, Negro; and fourth, economically deprived Spanish-surnamed. All differences between groups were significant at the one percent level of confidence. Spanish-surnamed students whose parents move into middle-class Anglo neighborhoods do function significantly better than either the Negro children or the other Spanish-surnamed children. In spite of the fact that most teachers *say* that Spanish-surnamed children in the heights have no language problem, as a group they performed significantly less well than the Anglo students.[2]

When intelligence testing was limited to performance tests like the Grace Arthur Point Performance Scale and the Goodenough Draw a Man Test, all ethnic groups of children were found to perform in the normal range. Based on such evidence accumulated over two decades, Havighurst wrote in 1957:[3]

> The conclusion drawn by most social scientists from the data on Indian cultures and Indian intelligence is that the American Indians of today have about the same innate equipment for learning as have the white children of America. But in those Indian tribes which have preserved their traditional cultures to some extent, there is a limited motivation of children for a high level performance in schools and colleges.

Fishman has succinctly stated the problem of using the usual standardized tests with divergent or minority groups.[4]

> Standarized tests currently in use present three principal difficulties when used with minority groups. First, they may not provide reliable

---

[2]William A. Candelaria, "A Comparative Investigation of the Understanding Which Sixth Grade Anglo, Spanish-American, and Negro Children Have of Analogies in the English Language," an unpublished study, College of Education, University of New Mexico, 1968, pp. 29-31.

[3]Robert J. Havighurst, "Education Among American Indians: Individual and Cultural Aspects," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (May, 1958), 311:113.

[4]Joshua Fishman, *et. al.* "Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children," *Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, (Ann Arbor: APA) ERIC Accession No. ED001649, 1963.

differentiation in the range of minority group scores. Also, many characteristics of minority group children affect test performance. The lower-class child will tend to be less verbal, less self-confident, less motivated toward academic achievement, less competitive intellectually, less exposed to stimulating materials in the home, less knowledgeable about the world, and more fearful of strangers than the middle-class child. The second difficulty is that the significance of the tests for predictive purposes may be quite different for the minority groups than for the standardization and validation groups. Factors that affect the test scores but which may have little relation to the criterion, such as test-taking skills, anxiety and motivation, may impair predictive validity. Also, the criteria which a test is predicting are usually more complex than the test itself. It is important to recognize the influence of such other factors as personality and background, which may be related to criterion performance. Test results cannot reveal the degree to which the status of disadvantaged children might change if environmental opportunities and incentives for learning were improved. Guidance and special training are therefore very important. Tests labeled culturally unfair may be valid predictors for school criteria which may be socially unfair. Most culture-free tests have low predictive validity for academic work.

There is little value in being concerned with the reading process and how it works, if the child's functioning level in language is too elementary for him to do higher level cognition using the language of the school. Geyer's model of reading as a visual perception process: verbal input, work recognition, sequencing, phrase recognition, and verbal output, is completely dependent upon one's facility in manipulating that language conceptually.[5]

The present-day writers like Goodman and Ruddell, who put their greatest emphasis on anticipating meaning in a line of print, help us to decrease emphasis on being over-analytical in the decoding, perhaps better called a recoding, process.

II. Achievement and Language

When Orozco[6] analyzed all of the many sub-tests of the CTBS and found *no* sub-test in which 5th grade Spanish-surnamed children achieved as well as Anglo 5th graders, there is little reason to suspect that analyzing higher cognitive processes could be productive. When one functions in a "weaker" language in which he has few memory items, he is sure to have shortcomings in analyzing, synthesizing, interpreting and evaluating.

Orozco concluded that:

1. The academic retardation of 5th grade Spanish-surnamed children has not substantially changed since 1945. This being the case:

   We must begin to look for all possible other causes

   a. Teacher expectation: Much of the literature reflects Rosenthal and Jacobson's

[5] John J. Geyer, "Models of Perceptual Processes in Reading," in Singer and Ruddell, editors, *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (Newark: IRA., 1970), p. 76.

[6] Cecilio Orozco, "Basic Skills Differences Between Fifth Grade Anglo and Spanish Surnamed Students in the Albuquerque Public School System," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Graduate School, University of New Mexico, 1971.

self-fulfilling prophecy.[7] Teacher expectations at work mold a self-concept that eventually becomes real.

b. Alienation: Valencia[8] (1971) points to the fact that alienation is a real factor when the schools do not use, accept, or value the students' home language as a medium of instruction in the school room.

   With respect to cultural relevancy and the use of our present culturally biased instruments, John[9] suggests there is an early need to "learn to learn" in the manner of the dominant culture in order to be able to compete with that culture in the schools.

c. Language: Gaarder[10] proposes bilingual education as a necessary plan of school organization to cope with some of the achievement problems of minority groups.

At this point, if fifth graders are as "handicapped" today as twenty-five years ago, one might say with Pogo, "We have met the enemy–and he is us."

For these reasons, then, it is necessary to look to linguistic kinds of measures to meet the achievement needs of Spanish-surnamed and Indian children in New Mexico.

Let me say just a word about our failure to understand or analyze the so-called language problem.

In the Southwest, school personnel have many stereotyped, pre-conceived ideas about the Spanish-speaking person. They generally believe that bilingualism, lack of verbal experience in English, inferiority of local Spanish, and a negative self-concept that is continually reinforced predetermine his educational retardation or failure and eventual dropping out of school. Sánchez wrote in 1966:[11]

> Still I was amazed at the persistence of the assertion that bilingualism is bad, that a foreign home language is a handicap, that somehow children with Spanish as a mother tongue were doomed to failure--in fact, that they were *ipso facto* less than normally intelligent.

Carter found that a great many Mexican-American and the English-speaking monolinguals generally agreed that local Spanish was grossly inferior. No Anglo speaker of Spanish agreed with this kind of comment. This pattern leads Carter to believe that most interviewees are influenced by prevailing stereotypes, and that Anglo Spanish-speakers may be able to escape this limited outlook and judge more on a factual basis the quality of the language, especially in terms of what may have been their difficulties in learning a second language.[12] Historically, in New Mexico, we have used

---

[7]Robert Rosenthal and Lenore F. Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

[8]Atilano A. Valencia, *Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Quest for Institutional Reform!* School Desegregation Project, The University of California, Riverside, 1971.

[9]Vera John, Lecture notes, Linguistic Seminar, College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, Spring, 1970.

[10]Bruce A. Gaarder, "Teaching the Bilingual Child: Research, Development and Policy," United States Office of Education. A workpaper presented to the Conference for the Teachers of Bilingual Children. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, June 10, 1964.

[11]George I. Sanchez, "History, Culture, and Education," Chapter I in Samora, Julian, ed., *La Raza: Forgotten Americans,* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), p. 15.

[12]Thomas Carter, *Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect,* (Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), pp. 52-53.

four basic approaches to the teaching of children for whom English was not their first language:

(1) We began by trying to obliterate the child's vernacular, assuming that the use of that language would retard his learning of English. Since the public school was to be a major vehicle of the melting–pot process, everyone was to be assimilated as quickly as possible into English textbooks.

(2) The second approach was based on the idea that if we would teach him a minimum vocabulary of words, then he could succeed in English. Some very well-meaning people promoted this point of view. However, the notion that learning a language consisted of learning *words* was not defensible. Learning a language is the process of understanding the syntax of that language -- hearing the stream of speech as people talk.

(3) The third approach evolved about ten years ago when we began talking about teaching English as a second language. This implied an organized, sequenced teaching of the syntax of English and the ability to use vocabulary items within that prescribed syntax. Modeling, pattern-practice, and contrastive analysis of phonemic differences were basic facets of English as a second language. This was a huge step in the right direction, but it left out the possibility that the lessons might not be motivating, stimulating or relevant from the child's point of view. Also minimizing the importance of the child's vernacular might cause the child to feel that his language was being put in an inferior, unacceptable position.

(4) Finally, it is hoped, we have arrived at the realization that the child comes to school with a well-developed language system. He can learn new concepts, think and solve problems, and continue developing a whole set of cognitive processes making use of the language system he already has. This does not mean at all that English will not be given attention in its proper sequence. *English is the national language and must be mastered.* With systematic instruction in English as a second language, the child, by grade four, should be able to have half of his school instruction in his vernacular and the other half in English. He can finish the elementary school as a competent bilingual.

When all such children are taught in this manner, they will no longer be branded as *disadvantaged* children; they will be the *advantaged* ones.

Spolsky and Holm[13] have reviewed the present attempt to revive literacy in the Navajo language:

> Two factors are converging to support the newest attempts to develop literacy in Navajo. The first is the change in educational climate. There is growing evidence to support the notion that teaching reading is easier in a child's strongest language. Thus, it is possible to persuade educators that children should be taught to read in the vernacular. Evidence from such studies as Nancy Modiano's[14] has convinced many educators that it is worth trying. With this sort of encouragement, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been prepared to offer some degree of minimal support to two or three pilot programs. . . Faced with a situation where so many children still speak Navajo, there are two main strategies: native language literacy, or effective

---

[13]Bernard Spolsky and Wayne Holm, "Literacy in the Vernacular: The Case for Navajo," *The Navajo Reading Study,* Report No. 8, College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, March, 1971.

[14]Nancy Modiano, "A Comparative Study of Two Approaches to the Teaching of Reading in the National Language," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University School of Education, 1966.

standard language teaching. Some reading experts tend to feel the solution is standard language teaching: while many of us with language teaching background find native language literacy more promising. Presumably, this suggests neither of the techniques has yet been shown to be effective.

The second factor is probably even more important, for it involves pressure from within the Navajo people rather than from outside. It is exemplified by the community school movement: there is increasing pressure for the Navajo communities to control their own schools. The examples of Rough Rock Demonstration school and now of the Ramah Community High School are applying pressure to the BIA and state school systems to pay much more attention to the wishes of the community. And the newly developed Dine Biolta Association is starting to become a force in education on the Reservation. So far, these Navajo groups have stressed the importance of the Navajo language. The programs are new and undeveloped, but there is a firm commitment to the use of Navajo throughout the school, to the teaching of reading Navajo, and language maintenance.

Many children are victimized by teachers who fail to realize that grade level is a statistical concept describing the midpoint in the achievement levels of a heterogeneous class of students. The term guarantees by definition that half of any normal group of pupils will achieve at grade level or above, while the other half will achieve at grade level or below.

When the *acceptable norm* in a class has been based on the work of the typical middle-class Anglo, the culturally different, language-handicapped student has had defeat predetermined for him. In that reference, school "competition" becomes a daily punishment for those of low ability, for whatever reason. Under circumstances in which few participants have a chance to win, it is not strange that many students protect themselves by exhibiting a low level of aspiration -- that is, by not trying.

Of course standardized tests of the traditional types have an important place in evaluating school curricula. But we have found many times the inadequacy of our results. We need to talk about some new kinds of tests that classroom teachers can use to measure language abilities of the students they teach.

The most available and the most valid of all these is the informal reading inventory.

III. Test Instruments

The informal reading inventory.

As soon as a teacher becomes concerned about how well each child reads, rather than how to divide children into groups, it becomes necessary to evaluate each one's oral and silent reading. The informal reading inventory is an informal measure enabling a teacher to do this. The child reads, first orally and then silently, from passages of material increasing in difficulty, a measure of his comprehension of the ideas in the passage is made, and his errors in the mechanics of reading are scored. The teacher can determine, rather quickly, the instructional, independent, and frustration reading levels of a child using this inventory.

This informal reading inventory is the most useful device any teacher has. She uses whatever reading material the child would be reading (it doesn't cost anything), it can be readily

administered, and it is more valid as a measure of reading ability than standardized tests. From the child's point of view, he can be made aware of just how well he now reads, he can be apprised of his specific weaknesses, and he can become aware of the progress he makes. It is advisable for the child to do his reading of the inventory on a tape recorder so that the teacher need only give attention to directing his reading and questioning his understanding. The tape can be replayed many times to check the reading errors.

If all teachers would only make use of such an inventory, and *teach reading skills at the child's instructional level, without regard to the age or grade level of the child*, many of the ills in our present reading programs would be cured.

In terms of language assessment, I'd like to discuss four measures that are worthy of some study. The first is the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, which is a standardized test available to any competent examiner. The second and third are dissertations currently underway at the University of New Mexico and the fourth a recently published study.

1. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA):[15]

   This test is designed to measure language development of young children. It was originally conceived as an instrument for assessing language in exceptional children of pre-school age. Those children who lack sufficient depth of cognitive language for beginning reading in first grade need some kind of assessment to discover areas of weakness so that they can be developed. This test is a good measure to help determine these weaknesses. The test contains ten sub-tests, of which these are examples:

   (a) Auditory-Vocal Automatic Test. This test samples the child's knowledge of standard sentence usage of inflected forms of words:

   "Here is an apple. Here are two_____."
   "This box is big. This box is even_____."
   "This man is painting. He is a_____.'
   "Father is hanging a picture. Now the picture has been_____."

   (b) Auditory-Vocal Association Test. This is a test relating verbal symbols by analogy. For example, "I sit on a chair. I sleep on a_____." "Cotton is soft; stones are_____." "A rabbit is swift; a turtle is_____."

   (c) Vocal Encoding Test. The child is asked to tell all he can about a simple object such as a block or a ball. The examiner can help him get started by asking questions for the first object: What is it? What is it made of? What color is it? and What do you use it for?

   (d) Auditory Decoding Test. This test measures the child's understanding of oral questions.

Do you eat?	Do cars cry?
Do you rain?	Do bananas telephone?
Do airplanes fly?	Do goats eat?

[15] By Samuel A. Kirk and James J. McCarthy, (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1968).

A profile of any child's abilities using these ten scores, prepared to test language ages between three and nine, can show the teacher diagnostically in which area of language development the child is weak. Teaching can then be directed to these needs.

2. Language Competence of Six- and Seven-Year-Olds

Maggart is developing an instrument to evaluate language of six-year-olds both formally and informally. The test involves repeating or responding to cues to produce samples of the phonemes, morphemes and syntax of English, especially those that might be troublesome. She is attempting to measure the language competency of entering first graders and of second graders. This concern is with vocabulary and comprehension as well as syntax, phonology, and morphology of the language. The oral attitude inventory is used in an individual tape-recorded interview situation.[16]

3. A Cloze Test of Oral Language of Six-Year-Olds

Using a corpus of speech taped in kindergartens and first grades of predominantly Anglo children, Craker[17] has developed a test of oral English including frequently occurring utterances. Her test utilizes the cloze procedure developed in silent reading and is based on the work of Darnell[18] as an oral clozentropy test of English language proficiency. She is measuring how well the child can anticipate meanings inspoken sentences when every nth word is deleted. She is administering the test to groups of lower middle-class unilingual English speakers, Spanish-surnamed children who have at least one Spanish-speaking parent, Navajo, and Black children all six years old in the first grade. It is hoped that the analysis of these data will reveal weaknesses in phonology, morphology, and syntax of which classroom teachers need to be aware and for which they need to develop competence *before* these children are expected to achieve the standard inflexible first grade course of study to which they are apt to be indiscriminately exposed. This kind of study should reveal information about the entry skills and behaviors of our children and through this revelation, point to more realistic kinds of language experiences for them when they come to the school.

4. Understanding of Deep Structure in Sentence Syntax, Marcus has developed a diagnostic test to measure the understanding of literal meaning by intermediate grade students through syntactic clues within written standard English sentences. I can best explain this by an example of what he is talking about. Listen to the sentence: "The man gave the boy a puppy." Now listen to four sentences and eliminate the three that do not have the same meaning.

The man gave away the boy's puppy.
The man gave a puppy to the boy.
The boy gave a puppy to the man.
The man gave a puppy away for the boy.

In my second example, three of four sentences have the same meaning. The student must

---

[16]Zelda Maggart, "A study of Language in First Grade Pupils Using Four Different Beginning Reading Emphases," Doctoral Dissertation in progress, Graduate School, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1971.

[17]Hazel Craker, "The Use of Clozentropy Procedure for Measuring Oral English Proficiency of Children of Beginning School Age," Doctoral Dissertation in progress, Graduate School, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1971.

[18]Donald K. Darnell, "The Development of an English Language Proficiency Test for Foreign Students, Using a Clozenthrophy Procedure," ERIC.

mark the one that has a different meaning.

Mother gave the baby a bottle.
The baby was given the bottle by mother.
The baby gave mother the bottle.
The bottle was given to the baby by mother.

Marcus hypothesized that such a test would be a valid measure of the students' ability to understand syntactic structures of subject-predicate, object or predicate noun, modifiers, and sentences with two or more syntactically equivalent units such as compound subjects, or compound sentences. When Marcus administered the test to 421 fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth graders he found the mean percent correct increased from 60% in fifth, to 66% in sixth, 73% in seventh, and 81% in eighth. This lends support to the validity.

The test served its diagnostic purpose by indicating those syntatic structures with which an individual student had difficulty. This information will enable teachers to plan specific programs for those students who need such additional instruction.[19]

IV. The Self-Concept in School

The two most significant areas for the child in which the school should have a positive role are in concept formation and in building a positive self-concept.

Concept formation is the ability to see that the same response may be given to a whole class of stimuli which have common characteristics. Children's intellectual functioning is based on the number, variety, and discrimination of concepts in their cognitive structures. *It is imperative that teachers be able to figure out which concepts children do and do not have.* Rote learning is quickly extinguished: therefore every new concept must be related to one the child already knows. One type of concept formation is the acquisition of meanings. Another is categorization. A concept must meet selected, specific criteria to be included in a broader classification: Pears, peaches, and apricots all meet the criteria as fruit.

A part of operant conditioning, but deserving of special emphasis, is the development of the self-concept. The self-concept is a measure of how the child perceives others to feel about him. The child who feels he is different needs to be shown that others accept him, his family, his different social values, *and especially his language.* There is a high correlation between a positive self-concept and academic success but even more important is the personal satisfaction resulting in good mental health.

The affective variables must be considered. Consider, for example, self-confidence as an affective variable. Self-confidence, in the education process, will enhance certain cognitive skills which in turn affect others, leading to improved performance in reading, which in turn leads to increased self-confidence. The child enters school already having learned certain ways of dealing with problems determined by his self-needs and cultural demands; the school needs to accept his coping styles and remain flexible enough to accommodate many different coping styles. While learning to read is a task imposed on each child by the culture, it also gives the child a very useful new tool to

---

[19]Albert David Marcus, "The Development of a Diagnostic Test of Syntactic Meaning Clues in Reading," in Robert E. Leibert, Ed., *Diagnostic Viewpoints in Reading.* (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1971), pp. 48-63

solve his problems if he learns successfully and opens up new worlds for him to explore. Successfully learning to read is a valuable contribution to the young child's development of mastery over his environment.

The school must strive harder to give the child a positive self-concept which is dependent on feelings of adequacy, sense of personal worth, self-confidence and self-reliance. Growing up requires a certain measure of independence and acceptance of leadership and responsibility. Children who exhibit higher levels of aspiration, stronger drive for achievement, and have greater curiosity generally have positive attitudes toward learning in school. These are variables that must be integrated with all the cognitive skills to be mastered. For children, there is probably no division in cognitive, emotional and social learning.[20]

Buckingham wrote, more than forty years ago:[21]

> There are no misfit children. There are misfit textbooks, misfit teachers, and misfit courses of study. But by the very nature of things there can be no misfit children. The child is what education is for. One might as well say that a man does not fit his trousers as to say that a child does not fit the school.

There is nothing *anyone* of you teachers is doing *that is absolutely necessary.* A fourth grade teacher, for example, is supposed to provide appropriate learning experiences for eight- and nine-year-olds. The *rigid, inflexible* set of books you provide a teacher to "pass out" to the individual members of her class *may* or *may not* be useful, unless carefully selected. Unless, at fourth grade, you have kept in mind the range of reading ability, the range of intellectual ability, and the range of interests and aptitudes, the set of books do *more harm* than *good. But*, it is important to add here, don't discard what you already have until you have something to take its place!

One of the reasons why so little of what a teacher does each day is vital, is that it is *superficial* and *ephemeral.* Out of a book, there are few facts that seem very important to the teacher so we try to prove the importance of them by testing the child to see if he learned them. We are apt to resort to mnemonic devices to help us remember trivia. As a child, I learned that you could spell "arithmetic" correctly if you used the first letter of each word in the sentence: "A *r*at *i*n *t*he *h*ouse *m*ight *e*at *t*he *i*ce *c*ream." And the order of letters in the word "geography" matched the first letters in *"George Ellen's o*ld *g*randmother *r*ode *a p*ig *h*ome *y*esterday."

Another example of our "distress" in school curriculum and its relevance appears in classrooms up and down the Rio Grande River in New Mexico. We have imported hundreds of teachers who teach third grade children that the first important event in American history was the arrival of the Pilgrims on the Mayflower in 1620. Little Pueblo Indian children whose heritage dates from literally thousands of years and Spanish-surnamed children whose heritage established a capitol of Spanish territory north of Santa Fe in 1598 learn quickly that school is one world and out-of-school is another and the two have little relationship.

If principals were able to help their faculties develop priorities in helping *children learn how to learn* instead of presenting a false idea that "we know what you need to know," we could then begin to shuck off much of our outmoded tradition and use our time to help each child achieve *his* objectives.

---

[20]Irene Athey, "Affective Factors in Reading," in Harry Singer and Robert Ruddell, editors, *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading,* (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1970), pp. 98-114.

[21]B. R. Buckingham, *Research for Teachers,* (Chicago: Silver Burdette and Company, 1926), p. 299.

The classroom must be a learning laboratory. The laboratory will thrive on interaction. If children actively participate, learning will develop through oral communication, listening to explanations, asking questions to clarify instructions, reporting, conversing, and discussing.

In a classroom laboratory, there can be no *minimum* or *maximum* level of performance set as a group standard. If a child is assigned to the room, then he *belongs*. He belongs just because he was assigned there. The laboratory must find ways to help him make progress on his growing edge of learning.

Principals *can* help teachers convert their classrooms into learning laboratories by program changes such as:

1) modular planning and team teaching;

2) measuring and establishing entry skills;

3) differentiated staffing;

4) listening centers;

5) individual contracts;

6) upgrading;

7) games corners;

8) interest centers.

V. Summary

It is necessary to determine what are the necessary skills for the child to have in order to perform the tasks that the school expects. Then, he must be observed in enough situations to see if he does or does not possess the skill.

Language maturity needs to be assessed in these children in terms of auditory discrimination of all the necessary phonemes, the habitual use of the correct syntax or grammar.

The typical unilingual English-speaking child has mastered all the forms of English by the time he comes to first grade: that is, he speaks easily in compound sentences or complex sentences or in compound-complex sentences.

Skills in remediation techniques and diagnostic practices are perhaps two of the most obvious abilities of an outstanding teacher.

The ability to conduct a meaningful conference with parents is a powerful tool that too few teachers possess.

One of the severest criticisms to be made about the affective learning of the child is that he derives negative reinforcement when he does not respond in the pattern that the teacher had in mind.

Interactions with the teacher on an individual basis is crucial to the child's getting the recognition that he needs as an individual.

I would like to say in closing that Pogo's expression "We have met the enemy--and he is us" may be a proper admonition to us, and we need to stop denying appropriate education to New Mexico's children.

Ungrading Teachers' Minds

I have been asked to talk about nongraded and continuous progress concepts as they relate to the teaching of reading. I have taken the liberty of altering this charge so that it focuses on nongraded and continuous progress concepts not as separate practices but as aspects of a more general humanistic orientation. I have taken this liberty because nongraded and continuous progress concepts are more powerful when we regard them as related to general educational purpose rather than as specific practices related to a specific part of the curriculum such as reading. I hope this change will not be inappropriate.

The Way Schools Are and Why They Are That Way

If we begin by examining the present purposes of education we very quickly come to understand the reason for the nearly total absence of nongraded and continuous progress practices in the schools. The reason is that nongraded and continuous progress practices are the visible manifestations of a humanistic philosophy, while the present dominant public school philosophy is decidedly anti-humanistic.

Of course, the schools do not purport to be anti-humanistic. In fact, they purport to be just the opposite. But schools, like people, must be judged on the basis of what they ultimately do, not just what they say they do. And anyone who has been in the schools very much and has seen what schools do can't feel very good about it. Here, for example, are some of the things schools do.

1) The schools accept, nurture and extend an exceedingly narrow range of behaviors and attitudes, usually those associated with middle class socio-economic status. All other behaviors and attitudes are ignored, deliberately taught out or actively punished.

2) The schools accept and enforce a single, linear standard of success which *guarantees* that some students will be winners and some students will be losers. That is, given group instruction and a fixed period of time for instruction, individual differences in learners forces differential achievement. This results in a nice, neat distribution to which A's, B's, C's, D's and F's can be assigned. Thus, every race has its winners and its losers.

3) The schools fail staggering numbers of students. Because of their inability to accept and nurture individuals with different behaviors and attitudes, and because of their linear standards of success, the schools condemn staggering numbers of students to a sub-standard life in a highly credentialed society. In short, the schools deny to many students credentials that are needed to achieve a decent life in society.

If one were to judge the purposes of the schools on the basis of the foregoing observations one would be forced to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the schools is the selection and advancement of the fit and the rejection of the unfit. It follows quite logically that schools with such purposes are inhospitable to nongraded and continuous progress practices, practices which are manifestations of humanistic purposes. In other words, humanistic practices cannot be truncated on top of educational philosophies which view the schools as institutions whose primary purpose is the selection and advancement of the fit and the rejection of the unfit. Present school purposes and nongraded and continuous progress practices are incompatible.

To repeat, *nongraded and continuous progress practices are manifestations of humanistic educational purposes.* The present dominant educational purposes are anti-humanistic. This is not to

suggest that there is an anti-humanistic conspiracy to maintain the status quo. A more accurate way to regard the present conditions in the schools is to view the schools as a reflection of society in general. That is, schools in any society exist to perpetuate the dominant values of that society. Our schools are sick because our society is sick. Our schools are, in effect, a microcosm of our society. The problem is not that our schools are irrelevant; they are appallingly relevant. They value, elevate and extend a narrow set of behaviors and attitudes; they encourage a mindless and destructive competition; and, they condemn to the human garbage heap those who either do not come to them with the appropriate behaviors and attitudes or who do not or cannot learn them.

What Teachers Can't Do

To understand the relationship between a society and its schools is to understand a great deal about what teachers can and cannot do. In the minds of many educational reformers, teachers are the key to the reform of the schools. That is, if only teachers would be more intelligent, better paid, more enthusiastic, less self-serving, more structured, less structured, younger, older, etc., then our educational problems would be solved. This belief attributes enormous powers to teachers -- far more than experience suggests is warranted. This view also ignores the staggering socializing power of the schools. That is, it ignores the power of institutions to define the roles that individuals will occupy. The fact is that teachers become what the schools want them to become, and the schools are shaped by the dominant social forces. Thus, teachers are far removed from the forces that shape educational purposes and dictate educational practices. What all this means is that it is folly to expect teachers to bring about changes which are not desired by the dominant forces in society and which are not given viable support by school administrations.

I feel it necessary at this point to emphasize that I am not discouraging teachers from implementing humanistic practices in their classrooms. In fact, I take the opposite position. Anything that can be done to humanize classroom practices is desirable. I merely wish to point out that there are practical limits which are dictated by forces in society, and that teachers cannot productively exceed these limits.

What Teachers Can Do

I am sure it is clear by now that I believe that the central thrust for any widespread implementation of humanistic practices must come from society in general, or at least from significant subgroups within society. However, there are some steps teachers can take now to make their classrooms more humane places for them and for their children; teachers can ungrade their minds.

We are, all of us, to a greater or lesser extent, in tune with the present purposes of the schools. That is, we hold certain beliefs which are consistent with and supportive of present educational purposes. Any serious attempt to humanize our classrooms must begin with an examination of these beliefs. Perhaps a useful way of approaching this task is to state a major belief dictated by the present orientation, state the counter belief dictated by a humanistic orientation and briefly compare the two.

Present Belief

1. Time needed for learning is constant from individual to individual.
2. Time allowed for learning is constant from individual to individual.

Humanistic Belief

1. Time needed for learning varies from individual to individual.
2. Time allowed for learning varies from individual to individual.

Present Belief	Humanistic Belief
3. Grading is based on a single, linear standard of success characterized by relative grading standards.	3. Grading, when it is employed, is characterized by absolute standards.
4. Evaluation is primarily summative in nature.	4. Evaluation is primarily formative in nature.
5. Learning mode is constant for all individuals.	5. Learning mode varies with individual needs.

With regard to the first belief, the sad fact is that too many of us believe that most, if not all, differences in our students' achievement can be attributed to differences in their desire to succeed. That is, all too many of us believe that the time needed for learning a given task is constant from individual to individual, and that differences in achievement are due to differences in desire to learn. In other words, when our students fail to achieve we say they are lazy, indifferent, poorly motivated or that they lack the will to succeed. In short, if they don't learn it's their fault.

A more humanistic way of regarding individual differences in learning is to view them as a function of time. That is, the amount of time an individual requires to master a given task can be regarded as that individual's aptitude for that particular task. Thus, if we accept the concept of individual differences it follows that for any given task a given group of individuals will be normally distributed with regard to aptitude for that task. Some individuals will have a very high aptitude, that is, they will require very little time to master the task. On the other hand, some individuals will have a very low aptitude, that is, they will require a considerable amount of time to master the task. The majority of individuals will fall between these two extremes. This particular view of individual differences focuses on rate differences rather than qualitative differences.

Since we are talking about time as a variable in learning, it seems appropriate at this time to introduce the second belief. If one believes that the time needed for learning is constant from individual to individual, and that differences in achievement are due to laziness, indifference or what have you, then it follows that one believes that the time allowed for learning should be constant for all students from task to task. Thus, we have the twenty-five minute arithmetic lesson, the forty-five minute social studies lesson, the nine week marking period, the four year college program, etc.

On the other hand, if one believes that differences in achievement are a function of time, and that given adequate time all or nearly all students can master a given task, then if follows that one believes that time allowed for learning should be variable. That is, in planning any learning experience, the teacher must regard time as a variable. Thus, instead of making judgments about student achievement based on time, the teacher focuses on the task to be completed and varies the time in such a manner as to allow students to successfully complete the task.

With regard to the third belief, it seems clear that if one accepts the belief that differential achievement is due to laziness, indifference or what have you, and if one accepts the belief that time available for learning should be held constant, then one has no difficulty accepting the present grading system. The present grading system is based on the beliefs that all individuals have equal aptitudes and that time should be held constant. Thus, it should come as no surprise to anyone to have a nice, neat achievement distribution at the end of a given instructional sequence. Given the

fact that individuals differ in the amount of time they need to master a learning task, and given that time is held constant by most teachers, the result is differential achievement which produces an achievement distribution to which A's, B's, C's, D's and F's can easily be assigned. It is clear that this grading practice creates losers. Whenever time is held constant, the achievement distribution approximates the aptitude distribution. That is, students who have a high aptitude succeed and students who have a low aptitude fail. It goes without saying that the winners are usually from the middle class socio-economic group while the losers are usually from homes where the behaviors and attitudes are in conflict with those valued by the schools.

Another negative aspect of the A, B, C, D and F grading system is that it does not address itself to what a student has or has not learned. Rather, it focuses on how one student fared with respect to another. Thus, if the highest grade in the class is 99 and the lowest is 72, the 99 gets an "A" while the 72 gets an "F." Nobody knows what the 72 means. But if the score of 72 were regarded from an absolute point of view (what minimum score can be accepted as an index of mastery) rather than from a relative point of view (how does this score compare with other student scores), it might well be decided that the score of 72 is sufficiently high to indicate that a student has mastered that particular learning task.

Clearly, it is far more humanistic to set realistic absolute standards of performance than it is to force students into destructive competitive situations in which many of them repeatedly lose. How many of us would allow ourselves to be placed in competitive situations in which we were destined to fail? It happens everyday to that physically and legally captive audience we call students.

In summary, absolute grading standards change the teacher's focus from inter-individual differences to how the individual deals with the particular task at hand. That is, instead of noting whether or not a particular student is near or at the top or bottom of the class, the teacher can focus instead on whether or not the student has sufficient mastery of the task to enable him to move to the next task. It seems clear that this is a far more humane approach to the problem of grading.

With regard to the fourth belief, it seems clear that teachers share the thinking that the schools should attend to the selection and advancement of the fit and the rejection of the unfit. Evidence for this belief is found in the fact that evaluation under our present purposes is concerned primarily with statements of individual worth. That is, evaluation in our present system is "summative" (worth oriented). Everybody knows what the grades of "A" and "D" communicate. They communicate that one student is a "winner" and that the other is a "loser." The present A, B, C, D and F system is a system that determines any given student's worth in terms of his relative position in his class. Summative evaluation - which in essence is a statement of an individual's worth--is the dominant form of evaluation in schools at the present.

A far more humanistic manner in which to view evaluation is to regard it as "formative" (direction giving). That is, instead of using evaluation to determine one individual's worth with respect to another, evaluation is employed in a diagnostic sense. Instead of being employed at the end of an instructional sequence as is summative evaluation, formative evaluation is employed at the beginning, throughout and at the end of an instructional sequence. It is employed in this manner to: 1) determine if the proposed instructional sequence is indeed an appropriate one for a given student; 2) to provide any needed "mid-course" corrections in the instructional sequence; and 3) to determine whether the student needs more experience at a given level or whether he may move to the next task. Evaluative data which are employed to help teachers make diagnostic decisions are far more useful than evaluative data collected after the fact and for the purpose of making worth judgments about individuals.

With regard to the fifth and final belief, it seems clear that as teachers we are of the mind that unless we are "teaching" (talking at students) no learning can possible be taking place. That is, we believe that students learn most and best by listening.

This approach is fine for passive, abstract, audio-oriented learners, but it is difficult for many students who learn in other ways. Some students learn more when some attempt is made to match their dominant learning mode(s) to a particular learning task. For example, some potentially productive learning modes for children who do not do well under the lecture system include individual study, group study, tutorial help (one to one relation between teacher and learner or between two learners), workbooks and programmed instruction, audio-visual methods and concrete manipulative activities.

A teacher who honestly attempts to provide for individual differences in students will make attempts to help students determine their best learning modes for a particular task. Often this will mean that the teacher's role will be that of a facilitator rather than that of a direct communicator of information.

It may be useful at this point to take a single instructional objective and outline briefly how the objective might be pursued under the present orientation and under a humanistic orientation.

Present Orientation

Objective

Read a selection from the reading text and answer 25 comprehension questions over the selection.

Source of Objective

Next page in the book.

Time Needed

All well motivated students can finish in the allowed time.

Time Allowed

Work is to be completed by the end of the 30 minute class period.

Grading

The student getting the most correct answers will receive the grade of "A." The student getting the fewest correct answers will receive the grade of "F."

Humanistic Orientation

Objective

Read a selection from the reading text and answer 25 comprehension questions over the selection.

Source of Objective

Formative evaluation.

Time Needed

Varies from individual to individual.

Time Allowed

No specific deadline is set. Children turn in work when they are ready.

Grading

A student will have demonstrated mastery of the task when he answers 15 or more of the questions correctly.

Present Orientation

Learning Mode

Students are expected to work individually

Evaluation

Evaluation is summative (worth oriented) and expressed in terms of the letter grades A, B, C, D and F.

Humanistic Orientation

Learning Mode

Each student selects his own learning mode. Some choose to work alone, some in pairs, some in small groups, etc.

Evaluation

Evaluation is formative (direction oriented) and provides the teacher and the student with the information necessary to determine if the student should move experiences at his present level.

Summary

If we are to judge the schools by what they do, we must conclude that by and large they serve the purpose of selecting and advancing the fit and rejecting the unfit. They do this not because teachers are bad, but because the schools are serving the interests of the dominant social forces.

Since the schools reflect society rather than shape it, widespread reform cannot be expected to come from within the schools. The demand for reform of school purposes and their attending practices must come from groups outside of the school setting.

Even though teachers cannot be expected to reform the schools, they can make their classrooms more humane environments both for themselves and for their students by examining and revising certain beliefs which lead to anti-humanistic school practices. The rejection of these beliefs and their attending practices is preliminary to the humanization of the schools.

References

The definition of aptitude employed in this paper is taken from Carrol, J., "A Model of School Learning," *Teachers College Record,* 1963, 64, 723-733.

The concepts of "formative" and "summative" evaluations employed in this paper are adaptations of the concepts as presented in "Evaluation Comment" (May, 1968, Vol. 1, No. 2), a bulletin published by the U. C. L. A. Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs.

This particular bulletin was devoted to the pre-publication presentation of a chapter which has since been published in *The Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*, Benjamin Bloom, J. Thomas Hastings and George Madaus, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1971.

Acknowledgements

The Communicative Arts Unit of the State Department of Education wishes to thank the following people for their participation in formulating the objectives of the Reading Conference held in Albuquerque in April, 1971.

Mr. Frank Ready, Director, Secondary Education
New Mexico State Department of Education

Mr. Don Harvey, Director, Title I, ESEA
New Mexico State Department of Education

Mrs. Blanche Collie, Director, Elementary Education
New Mexico State Department of Education

Mrs. Carol Alalouf, Consultant
Albuquerque Public Schools

Miss Rosina Espinoza, Teacher
Española Elementary School

Mrs. Fay Meyer, Curriculum Coordinator
Albuquerque Public Schools

Dr. Verna Vickery, Private Consultant
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Miles V. Zintz, Professor
University of New Mexico

Dr. Walter Wier, Director of Elementary Education
Santa Fe Public Schools

Dr. Mildred Fitzpatrick, Programs Analyst
Albuquerque Public Schools